



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,468	04/01/2004	Ryan E.T. Sanders	110172.403	8409

500 7590 08/20/2008

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC

701 FIFTH AVE

SUITE 5400

SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER

FACTOL, NICHOLAS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,468

Applicant(s)

SANDERS ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas C. Pachol

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 17-34 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 17-34 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 17 and 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 8, 17-20, 25, 29, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redd (US 6,646,754) in view of Carroll (US 2003/0142350).

Regarding Claim 1, Redd teaches a method (Column 4, lines 65-67), comprising:
receiving a print job that requests to print a set of electronic document pages that are available from a communication network (Column 10, lines 32-49);

breaking up the print job into a plurality of batches each having a plurality of electronic document pages that together form the set of electronic document pages (Column 15, line 40 - Column 16, line 6).

applying stamps to the electronic document pages of each batch of said print job (Column 17, line 40 - Column 18, line 15); and

separately sending said each batch having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to a client terminal to be printed, while electronic document pages of other batches of said print job are having stamps applied to them (Column 19, lines 26-52).

Redd does not teach wherein all said batches of said print job are sent to said client terminal for printing on a same single printer of said client terminal.

However Carroll does teach wherein all said batches of said print job are sent to said client terminal for printing on a same single printer of said client terminal (Page 3, paragraph 61).

Redd and Carroll are combinable because they both deal with batch printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd with the teachings of Carroll for the purpose of providing easier control of a multipart print job (Carroll: Page 1, paragraph 7).

Regarding Claim 2, Redd further teaches logging print job status information as electronic document pages of each batch are stamped and sent to the client terminal (Column 19, lines 10-25).

Regarding Claim 3, Carroll further teaches if an interruption occurs during printout of electronic document pages of a batch (Page 3, paragraph 58):

checking the logged print job status information to determine which batch was last successfully printed (Page 3, paragraph 58)); and

re-starting the print job at a batch subsequent to the batch that was last successfully printed, instead of re-starting the print job from its beginning first batch (Page 3, paragraph 61).

Redd and Carroll are combinable because they both deal with batch printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd with the teachings of Carroll for the purpose of providing easier control of a multipart print job (Carroll: Page 1, paragraph 7).

Regarding Claim 4, Redd further teaches receiving a poll from the client terminal that requests transmission of electronic document pages that have been stamped (Column 20 ,line 53- Column 21, line15);

sending the requested stamped electronic document pages to the client terminal, the requested stamped electronic document pages sent to the client terminal comprising less than a complete batch (Column 20 ,line 53- Column 21, line15).

Regarding Claim 5, Redd further teaches receiving a download request for another set of electronic document pages (Column 19, lines 26-30, where the download request is considered any request for a print job across the network);

breaking up the download request into a plurality of batches each having a plurality of electronic document pages that together form the another set of electronic document pages (Column 15, line 40 - Column 16, line 6);

applying stamps to these electronic document pages of each batch (Hansen: Column 10, lines 42-64); and

separately sending each of these batches having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to the client terminal, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them (Column 17, line 40 - Column 18, line 15).

Regarding Claim 8, Redd further teaches storing print job data, including template information usable for applying the stamps to the electronic document pages, at a first server remote from the client terminal (Column 18, lines 41-62);

if the print job is generated, providing at least some of the print job data to the client terminal (Column 18, lines 63- Column 19, line10);

at a second server, receiving the print job data from the client terminal and obtaining template information corresponding to the print job data from the first server (Column 19, lines 26-52).

Regarding Claim 17, Redd teaches a system (Column 5, lines 43-47) comprising:

a printer executable component to control download of remote electronic files to a printer (Column 10, lines 32-49);

a server communicatively coupled to the printer executable component to store print job data (Column 18, lines 41-62); and

at least one stamping service in communication with both the server and the printer executable component (Column 17, line 40 – Column 18, line 15), wherein if the printer executable component is launched to initiate a print job, the printer executable component is coupled to obtain at least some of the stored print job data from the server and to provide this obtained print job data to the stamping service (Column 19, lines 26-52), the printer executable component being capable to use the print job data provided by the printer executable component to obtain stamps from the server that are to be applied to a set of electronic files and to break up the print job into multiple batches having a plurality of pages that together form the set of electronic files (Column 15, line 40 – Column 16, line 6 and Column 19, lines 26-52), the printer executable component being further capable to apply the stamps to pages of each batch and to download the pages having stamps applied thereon to either one or both the printer executable component and the printer while pages of other batches are being stamped (Column 19, lines 26-52),

Redd does not teach wherein all of said multiple batches of said print job are sent to same said printer to be printed therefrom.

However Carroll does teach wherein all said batches of said print job are sent to said client terminal for printing on a same single printer of said client terminal (Page 3, paragraph 61).

Redd and Carroll are combinable because they both deal with batch printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd with the teachings of Carroll for the purpose of providing easier control of a multipart print job (Carroll: Page 1, paragraph 7).

Regarding Claim 18, Redd further teaches a plurality of stamping services, each stamping service being capable to stamp pages of batches corresponding to a same print job (Column 17, lines 51-15).

Regarding Claim 19, Redd further teaches wherein the printer executable component is capable to poll the stamping service to request pages that have been stamped (Column 20, line 53 – Column 21, line 15), the stamping service being further capable to send the requested pages, which may comprise less than all pages in a batch (Column 20, line 53 – Column 21, line 15).

Regarding Claim 20, Redd further teaches wherein the stamping service is capable to provide print job updates to the server, wherein the printer executable component can access the print job updates at the server to re-start the print job in case of interruption, at a batch subsequent to a batch that was last successfully printed, instead of a re-start of the print job from a first batch (Column 18, lines 41-62 and Column 19, lines 25-52).

Regarding Claim 25, Redd further teaches further comprising at least another executable component, including a download executable component to control storage of stamped pages of batches to a storage unit (Column 19, lines 11-25).

Regarding Claim 29, Redd teaches a system (Column 5, lines 43-47) comprising:
a means for receiving a print job that requests to print a set of electronic document pages that are available from a communication network (Column 10, lines 32-49);

a means for breaking up the print job into a plurality of batches each having a plurality of electronic document pages that together form the set of electronic document pages (Column 15, line 40 – Column 16, line 6).

a means for applying stamps to the electronic document pages of each batch of said print job (Column 17, line 40 – Column 18, line 15);

and a means for separately sending said each batch having stamps applied to its electronic document pages to a client terminal to be printed, while electronic document pages of other batches are having stamps applied to them (Column 19, lines 26-52).

Redd does not teach wherein all said batches of said print job are sent to said client terminal for printing on a same single printer of said client terminal.

However Carroll does teach wherein all said batches of said print job are sent to said client terminal for printing on a same single printer of said client terminal (Page 3, paragraph 61).

Redd and Carroll are combinable because they both deal with batch printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd with the teachings of Carroll for the purpose of providing easier control of a multipart print job (Carroll: Page 1, paragraph 7).

Regarding Claim 33, Redd further teaches a means for polling to identify and obtain electronic document pages of a batch that have been stamped and that can be printed (Column 20, line 53 – Column 21, line 15), wherein such electronic document pages comprise less than a full batch (Column 20, line 53 – Column 21, line 15).

Regarding Claim 34, Redd further teaches user interface means for creating templates (Column 10, lines 32-49) and for initiating print jobs (Column 10, lines 32-49).

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redd (US 6,646,754) in view of Carroll (US 2003/0142350) further in view of Lutz (US 2005/0076298).

Regarding Claim 6, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach wherein receiving the download request comprises receiving a request to store the requested set of electronic document pages in a storage unit.

However, Lutz does teach wherein receiving the download request comprises receiving a request to store the requested set of electronic document pages in a storage unit (Page 2, paragraph 9).

Redd in view of Carroll and Lutz are combinable because they all manage print jobs.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Red in view of Carroll with Lutz to decrease the amount of time it takes to process a print job (Lutz: Page 1, paragraph 6).

5. Claims 7, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redd (US 6,646,754) in view of Carroll (US 2003/0142350) further in view of Ferlitsch (US 2004/0190042).

Regarding Claim 7, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach determining whether a printer executable component to manage flow of the received stamped electronic document pages to a print spooler is present at the client terminal;

if the printer executable component is determined to not be present, downloading and installing the printer executable component in the client terminal; and
launching the printer executable component if a print job is generated.

Ferlitsch does teach determining whether a printer executable component to manage flow of the received stamped electronic document pages to a print spooler is present at the client terminal (Page 6, paragraph 66);

if the printer executable component is determined to not be present, downloading and installing the printer executable component in the client terminal (Page 6, paragraph 66); and

launching the printer executable component if a print job is generated (Page 6, paragraph 66, where the installation is launching the executable).

Redd in view of Carroll and Ferlitsch are combinable because they deal with batch printing.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with Ferlitsch for the purpose of allowing the printer to perform the necessary functions through the use of an updated drive, firmware of user interface (Ferlitsch: Page 2, paragraph 17).

Regarding Claim 27, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach another server to download the printer executable component to a client terminal if the printer executable component is not installed in the client terminal if the print job is initiated.

Ferlitsch does teach another server to download the printer executable component to a client terminal if the printer executable component is not installed in the client terminal if the print job is initiated (Page 6, paragraph 66).

Redd in view of Carroll and Ferlitsch are combinable because they deal with batch printing.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with Ferlitsch for the

purpose of allowing the printer to perform the necessary functions through the use of an updated drive, firmware of user interface (Ferlitsch: Page 2, paragraph 17).

Regarding Claim 28, Ferlitsch further teaches wherein the printer executable component is downloaded to be installed as part of a browser application on the client terminal (Page 6, paragraph 66, from a web-site constitutes part of a browser application).

Redd in view of Carroll and Ferlitsch are combinable because they deal with batch printing.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with Ferlitsch for the purpose of allowing the printer to perform the necessary functions through the use of an updated drive, firmware of user interface (Ferlitsch: Page 2, paragraph 17).

6. Claims 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redd (US 6,646,754) in view of Carroll (US 2003/0142350) further in view of Kremer (US 2004/0158655).

Regarding Claim 9, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach making a temporary copy of the each electronic document page, wherein applying stamps to electronic document pages of each batch includes applying stamps to the temporary copies.

However, Kremer does teach making a temporary copy of the each electronic document page, wherein applying stamps to electronic document pages of each batch includes applying stamps to the temporary copies (Page 6, paragraph 45, where Redd has already broken up the document into different batches).

Redd in view of Carroll and Kremer are combinable because they all manage print jobs across a network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with Kremer for maintaining an additional copy of the print job (Page 7, paragraph 51).

Regarding Claim 22, Redd further teaches a first server unit to store indexed content of the electronic files (Figure 1, element 120 and Column 7, lines 42-55);

a second server unit to store metadata content of the electronic files, the metadata content including stamps that can be obtained by the stamping service and applied to pages of the electronic files (Figure 1, element 118 and Column 6, lines 26-33).

Redd in view of Carroll does not teach a third server unit to store the pages of the electronic files, the stamping service being capable to obtain a temporary copy of the stored pages and to apply the stamps thereto.

However, Kremer does teach a third server unit to store the pages of the electronic files, the stamping service being capable to obtain a temporary copy of the stored pages and to apply the stamps thereto (Page 6, paragraph 45).

Redd in view of Carroll and Kremer are combinable because they all manage print jobs across a network.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with Kremer for maintaining an additional copy of the print job (Page 7, paragraph 51).

7. Claims 10, 23, 24, 26, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redd (US 6,646,754) in view of Carroll (US 2003/0142350) in view of Hansen (US 6,407,820).

Regarding Claim 10, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach generating stamping statistics indicative of either one or both of which electronic document pages have been stamped and an amount of electronic document pages that have been stamped.

Hansen does teach generating stamping statistics indicative of either one or both of which electronic document pages have been stamped and an amount of electronic document pages that have been stamped (Column 8, line 64-Column 9, line 3, since the documents that need to be stamped are shown in the preflight stage, then once they are stamped they are sent to the production staged and ready to be ready. By this, the documents that are in the print queue are the documents that have been stamped).

Redd in view of Carroll and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 23, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach a stamping data store in communication with the stamping service to store stamping statistics that can be provided by the stamping service.

Hansen does teach a stamping data store in communication with the stamping service to store stamping statistics that can be provided by the stamping service (Column 8, line 64-Column 9, line 3, since the documents that need to be stamped are shown in the preflight stage, then once they are stamped they are sent to the production staged and ready to be ready. By this, the documents that are in the print queue are the documents that have been stamped).

Redd in view of Carroll and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 24, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach wherein the server can request print preview information from the stamping service, the stamping service being capable to provide the preview information as a representation of a page having

stamps applied thereto, the server being able to subsequently provide the preview information to the printer executable component.

Hansen does teach wherein the server can request print preview information from the stamping service, the stamping service being capable to provide the preview information as a representation of a page having stamps applied thereto, the server being able to subsequently provide the preview information to the printer executable component (Column 10, lines 54-64).

Redd in view of Carroll and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 26, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach comprising a plurality of user interface usable to perform at least one of create a template having the stamps, assign Bates number formats to the electronic files, identify a print job, view print job status information, select a location to save the stamped pages, and select a printer to print the stamped pages.

Hansen does teach comprising a plurality of user interface usable to perform at least one of create a template having the stamps, assign Bates number formats to the electronic files, identify a print job, view print job status information, select a location to

save the stamped pages, and select a printer to print the stamped pages (Column 10, line 41- Column 11 line 2).

Redd in view of Carroll and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 31, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach a means for updating print job status information and for keeping stamping statistics.

Hansen does teach a means for updating print job status information and for keeping stamping statistics (Column 8, line 64-Column 9, line 3, since the documents that need to be stamped are shown in the preflight stage, then once they are stamped they are sent to the production staged and ready to be ready. By this, the documents that are in the print queue are the documents that have been stamped).

Redd in view of Carroll and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Regarding Claim 32, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach means for downloading batches having stamped electronic document pages for purposes different from printing.

Hansen does teach means for downloading batches having stamped electronic document pages for purposes different from printing (Column 6, lines 26-33 and Figure 1, element 118, where saving the document is different from printing).

Redd in view of Carroll and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

8. Claims 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redd (US 6,646,754) in view of Carroll (US 2003/0142350) further in view of Shaw (US 5,602,974).

Regarding Claim 11, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach printing the stamped electronic document pages asynchronously from other applications running on the client terminal.

However, Shaw teaches printing the stamped electronic document pages asynchronously from other applications running on the client terminal (Column 9, lines 39-40).

Redd in view of Carroll and Shaw are combinable because they all deal with processing print jobs.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Shaw to allow the print jobs to be more quickly spooled than conventional systems (Column 9, lines 17-39).

Regarding Claim 21, Redd in view of Carroll does not teach wherein the printer executable component operates asynchronously of client applications.

However, Shaw does teach wherein the printer executable component operates asynchronously of client applications (Column 9, lines 39-40).

Redd in view of Carroll and Shaw are combinable because they all deal with processing print jobs.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Shaw to allow the print jobs to be more quickly spooled than conventional systems (Column 9, lines 17-39).

9. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redd (US 6,646,754) in view of Carroll (US 2003/0142350) further in view of Hansen (US 6,407,820) further in view of Ferlitsch (US 2004/0190042).

Regarding Claim 30, Redd further teaches a means for storing the electronic document pages and associated metadata, including template information having the stamps that can be applied to the electronic document pages (Column 18, lines 41-62);

a means for querying for and returning corresponding data results associated with stored electronic document pages that can be stamped (Column 19, lines 10-25).

Redd in view of Carroll does not teach a means for providing preview information of electronic document pages showing stamps applied thereto; and

a means for downloading executable files to the client terminal if the executable files are not yet installed in the client terminal when the print job is initiated.

Hansen does teach a means for providing preview information of electronic document pages showing stamps applied thereto (Hansen: 57-66).

Redd in view of Carroll and Hansen are combinable because they both deal with processing print jobs in a network.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll with the teachings of Hansen to add value to the print production process (Hansen: Column 6, lines 51-59).

Ferlitsch does teach a means for downloading executable files to the client terminal if the executable files are not yet installed in the client terminal when the print job is initiated (Ferlitsch: Page 6, paragraph 66).

Redd in view of Carroll further in view of Hansen and Ferlitsch are combinable because they deal with batch printing.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Redd in view of Carroll further in view of Hansen with Ferlitsch for the purpose of allowing the printer to perform the necessary functions though the use of an updated drive, firmware of user interface (Ferlitsch: Page 2, paragraph 17).

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-

270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thr, 8:00 a.m.- 4:00 p.m. (EST), Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N.P.
08/14/08

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625